

REMARKS

Claims 5, 12 and 15 have been amended to improve the clarity of the claimed subject matter and to bring the claims into conformity with U.S. practice and format, and to place the application fully in condition for allowance. The original Abstract has been amended to provide a more concise summary of the disclosure in accordance with U.S. practice format.

Claim 12 is objected to due to an informality. According, "power" has been replaced with "power line", as suggested by the Examiner. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 remain pending upon entry of the amendments to the claims above.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 5-11 and 15-20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claims 5 and 15 have been rewritten as independent claims. Claims 6-11 invariably depend from claim 5, and claims 16-20 likewise depend from claim 15. It is respectfully believed that claims 5-11 and 15-20 are now in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Applicant's prior art (Figure 1 of the application). Applicant most respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant respectfully wishes to direct the Examiner's attention to MPEP § 2131 which states that to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim

is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed.Cir. 1990).

The claimed invention includes a structure for a power line fixing module for an electronic apparatus. The claimed structure utilizes a fixing medium (33) for fixing the connector (322) of the power line (32) in the fixing hole (312) of a first side plate (311) of the electronic-apparatus housing (31), as clearly illustrated in Figure 3 of the application.

With regard to Applicant's first prior art (Figure 1), the Examiner has equated the power input element 14 of Figure 1 to the fixing medium (33) of the claimed invention. The Examiner is referred to the third paragraph of the specification which states "The conventional power adapted includes a metal extrusion housing 11, a first side plate 12, a second plate 13, a power input element 14 and a power output elements 15." In other words, reference element 14 of Figure 1 is the power input element of the power adapter. Further, the power input element 14 is generally a socket which can be connected to the printed circuit board 16 through one end thereof and connected to a connector 171 of an external power line 17 through the other end thereof for inputting an external AC power to the printed circuit board 16. Hence, the power input element 14 of Figure 1 is used as an AC inlet of the adapter for electrically connecting the power line 17 and the printed circuit board 16 in the adapter, but the power element input 14 is not utilized as a fixing medium for fixing the power line 17, unlike the claimed invention.

Further, the connector 171 of the power line 17 of Figure 1 is simply plugged into the opening of the power input element 14 and connected to the conducting elements that are disposed inside the power input element 14. However, the power input element 14 of Figure 1 does not have the function of fixing the connector 171 of the power line 17, and therefore, one can easily pull out the connector 171 of the power line 17 from the power input element 14 by utilizing an external force. Thus, it is respectfully believed that the power input element 14 of Figure 1 is patentably distinct from the fixing medium of the claimed invention.

In addition, with reference to Figure 3 of the application, the fixing medium (33) is an additional element for fixing the connector (322) of the power line (32) in the fixing hole (312) of the first side plate (311) of the electronic-apparatus housing (31), the structure and function of which are neither disclosed, taught nor suggested in Figure 1 of the application.

In summary, Figure 1 merely discloses a conventional power adapter with a power input element 14 configured for plugging the connector 171 of the power line therein, but is not configured for securely fixing the connector 171 of the power line 17 therein/thereon. It is respectfully believed that the claimed fixing medium (33) is not taught by Figure 1 of the application.

In view of the remarks above, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Applicant's prior art of Figure 1 in view of Applicant's prior art of Figure 2. The Examiner seeks to further modify the base reference of Figure 1 according to the teachings of Figure 2 in order to teach a connector of a power line comprising a seal consisting of a first flanged ring, a second flanged ring and a groove, wherein the

Application No.: 10/676,021
Amendment dated: September 17, 2004
Reply to Office Action of: June 17, 2004

groove is positioned between the first flanged ring and the second flanged ring. Applicant respectfully submits that even if Figure 2 of the application discloses the elements mentioned by the Examiner in this regard, further modification of the base reference (Figure 1) will not result in the claimed invention, as discussed previously above with regard to the rejection of claims based on 35 USC 102.

In view of the remarks above, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that none of the prior art individually or collectively shows the invention as claimed. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims appears to be warranted and the same is respectfully requested. In the event there are any outstanding matters remaining in the present application which can be resolved by a telephone call or facsimile communication to Applicant's Attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone or facsimile at the numbers provided below.

Respectfully submitted,
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



WONKI K. PARK
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,991

Date: September 17, 2004

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Telephone: 703-683-0500
Facsimile: 703-683-1080

WP/jrs

S:\Producer\wp\CHEN 676021\amendment.wpd